REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1, 17, and 25 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration with further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview granted to Applicants' representative on May 17, 2007, at which time the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, was discussed. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the rejection was based on the contention that claim 1 was unclear as to whether the recited activities are performed with the first/second fields or the recited associations of identifiers are performed with the first/second fields.

In the Office action mailed February 28, 2007, the drawings filed June 14, 2004 were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 121(d). In particular, the objection contends that the drawings filed June 14, 2004 are amendments to the original drawings.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In this regard, the drawings filed June 14, 2004 were intended to be formal versions of the original drawings and are submitted within the period for submitting formal drawings set under 37 C.F.R. § 1.85(c).

If the Examiner is aware of any inadvertent amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the changes be identified. Accordingly, the objection is traversed on the ground that no amendments to the original drawings were made.

The ABSTRACT was objected to as exceeding 150 words. The ABSTRACT has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

The title of the application was objected to as not being descriptive of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree. The claimed subject matter does indeed relate to object tailoring, and hence the former title was descriptive. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended the title to "OBJECT CLASS DEFINITION TAILORING."

Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 16, 17, and 25 were objected to as including typographical and other informalities. Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful reading of the claims. These claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns, generally as suggested by the Examiner. One exception is claim 1, which has been amended to recite "one or more data processing apparatus." In light of common usage of the term "apparatus" to denote both the singular and the plural, this recitation is believed to be proper and address the Examiner's concerns.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The rejection contends that the specification does not enable one of ordinary skill to release a predefined field for display to all participants.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Attention is respectfully directed to FIGS. 16, 17, 18, and the text description thereof. In an illustrative example, the specification describes how the exclusion of a user from display of a field can be ended. *See, e.g., specification*, page 15, line 19-23. More generically, the specification also describes how the status profile associated with a tailored object (e.g., at the field level) can be changed. *Id.*, page 14, line 25- page 15, line 6. Changes to such a status profile can end the exclusion of a user from display of a field. *Id.*, page 15, line 18-23.

It is well-established that rejections based on the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, must establish a reasonable basis for questioning the adequacy of the disclosure to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention without resorting to undue experimentation. *See, e.g., M.P.E.P.* § 2161.01 (III) (*citing In re Brown*, 477 F.2d 946 (C.C.P.A. 1973). In the present case, the specification explicitly enables one of ordinary skill to end the exclusion of a user from display of a field using changes to the status profile associated with a tailored object. There is no reason to believe that a person of ordinary skill would require undue experimentation to release a predefined field for display to all users.

Accordingly, the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been satisfied. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 thereunder be withdrawn.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The rejection contends that claim 1 is unclear as to whether the recited activities are performed with the first/second fields. Claim 1 has been amended to recite activities that involve the first/second fields. Accordingly, applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-13, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 15, 22, and 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite on various grounds. The claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The rejection contends that one of ordinary skill would not be able to discern the scope of "releasing a predefined field for display."

Applicants respectfully disagree. There is no reason to believe that one of ordinary skill would not be able to discern how a predefined field can be released for display, especially in light of the description in the specification regarding the exclusion of fields from display. *See, e.g., Specification*, FIGS. 16, 17, 18, and the text description thereof.

Accordingly, the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, have been satisfied. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 thereunder be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection contends that associating identifiers with fields is not a tangible result.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the associations of the first/second identifiers with the first/second fields are made available for data processing activities. Accordingly, these associations are tangible and made available for data processing activities.

Further, please note that claim 1 recites that a user is presented with options for tailoring. Such a presentation of options to a user is a physical transformation, e.g., of a display device. Accordingly, claim 1 is directed to statutory subject matter.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection contends that a system which includes a data storage device and a data processing device is not statutory based on an alleged failure to achieve a practical utility recited in the specification.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The recited system is configured to change a status of a field in a first instance of tailored object based on an identification of the trigger. This has practical utility, e.g., in determining whether the field is excluded from display. *Specification*, page 15, line 18-23.

Accordingly, claim 17 is directed to statutory subject matter.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection contends that "memory for storing data for access during performance of a set of machine readable instructions for performing operations on a data processing system" is neither a machine or a manufacture.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Such memory is both a machine and a manufacture and constitutes statutory subject matter. *See, e.g., In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Accordingly, claim 25 is directed to statutory subject matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0154403 to Keinsley et al. (hereinafter "Kiensley"). As shown above, claim 1 has been amended to define the claimed subject matter more clearly. Accordingly, withdrawal of the art rejection is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 1 relates to a computer program product, tangibly embodied in one or more information carriers, for tailoring the storage of information. The computer program product comprises instructions operable to cause one or more data processing apparatus to present a user with options for tailoring an object class definition, receive user input for tailoring the object class definition in response to the presentation of options, redefine the tailored object class definition to include the first field and the second field, associate a first identifier with the first field to identify that the first user or group of users is to be excluded from a first activity that involves the first field, and associate a second identifier with the second field to identify that the second user or group of users is to be excluded from a second activity that involves the second field, and make the association of the first identifier with the first field and the association of the second identifier with the second field available for data processing activities.

The user input identifies a first field to be included in the tailored object class definition, a second field to be included in the tailored object class definition, a first user or group of users, and a second user or group of users.

Keinsley is not understood to disclose or to suggest features of claim 1. For example, Keinsley is not understood to disclose or to suggest presenting a user with options for tailoring an object class definition, as recited in claim 1. Keinsley is also not understood to disclose or to suggest redefining a tailored object class definition to include a first field and a second field identified in user input received in response to the presentation of options, as recited in claim 1.

In this regard, Keinsley describes web-based security applications that provide controlled access to data. *See, e.g., Keinsley*, para. [0003]. As part of these applications, Keinsley describes that an administrator can temporarily suspend access of a user to data. *See, e.g., Keinsley*, para. [0570]. Such a suspension of access can involve the creation of record of the start date and the end date of the suspension. *Id.*

Creating such records neither describes nor suggests any tailoring of object class definitions. Indeed, Keinsley's appears to be quite thorough in describing the various tables that are defined in his data model but makes no mention whatsoever that any tailoring of an object class definition can or should occur. *See, e.g., Keinsley*, para. [0755]-[0971].

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom are believed to be patentable over Keinsley.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kiensley.

Claim 17 relates to system that includes a data storage device including tailored data object class definitions and a data processing device in data communication with the data storage device. The tailored data class definitions having user-defined data fields. The data processing device is configured to perform data processing activities in accordance with a set of machine-readable instructions. The activities include identifying a trigger and changing a status of a field in a first instance of a tailored object based on identification of the trigger. The status of the field is associated with an activity that involves the field and with a participant who is excluded from involving the field in the activity.

Keinsley is not understood to disclose or to suggest features of claim 17. For example, Keinsley is not understood to disclose or to suggest changing, in an instance of an object, a status of a field that is associated with an activity that involves the field and with a participant who is excluded from involving the field in the activity, as recited in Claim 17.

In this regard, as discussed above, Keinsley describes that an administrator can temporarily suspend access of a user to data in a web-based security application. Such a suspension of access can involve the creation of record of the start date and the end date of the suspension. The record can also indicate that the status of the user's suspension is "active" or "inactive." *See, e.g., Keinsley*, FIG. 15B.

Changing the status of a user's suspension neither describes nor suggests changing a status of a field in an instance of an object. A user's suspension is not a field in an instance of an object. Indeed, it is clear that the status of the user's suspension can be changed from "active" to "inactive" without any change whatsoever to the status of the field of a record that describes the suspension.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 17 and the claims dependent therefrom are believed to be patentable over Keinsley.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kiensley. As shown above, claim 25 has been amended to define the claimed subject matter more clearly. Accordingly, withdrawal of the art rejection is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 25 relates to memory for storing data for access during performance of a set of machine readable instructions for performing operations on a data processing system. The memory includes a data structure definition stored in the memory. The data structure definition includes a data structure definition identifier, a collection of one or more hardcoded elements hardcoded into the data structure definition, and a collection of one or more tailored elements to fit a specific data processing activity of a user.

Keinsley is not understood to disclose or to suggest features of claim 25. For example, Keinsley is not understood to disclose or to suggest a data structure definition that includes a data structure definition identifier, a collection of one or more hardcoded elements, and a collection of one or more tailored elements, as recited in claim 25.

In this regard, as discussed above, although Keinsley appears to be quite thorough in describing the various tables that are defined in his data model, Keinsley makes no mention whatsoever that any tailoring of the data model can or should occur.

The rejection of former claim 25 was based on the contention that the table column headers in the table shown in Keinsley's FIG. 15A are hardcoded elements and the contents of the table shown in Keinsley's FIG. 15A are tailored elements. However, it is clear that the table shown in Keinsley's FIG. 15A is not a data structure definition as now recited in claim 25.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 25 and the claims dependent therefrom are believed to be patentable over Keinsley.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, all dependent claims have not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' attorney can be reached at the address shown below. Telephone calls regarding this application should be directed to 858-678-4346.

No fees are believed due at this time. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 13907-047001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2007

John F. Conroy
Reg. No. 45,485

Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

JFC/jhg
10736789.doc